

REMARKS

Claim 24 has been objected to because this New claim has been listed as an amended claim.

Claim 31 has been objected to as incorrectly depending from previously canceled claim 4.

Claim 23 has been found to be substantially a duplicate of claim 27.

Claims 21, 22, 24-26, and 28-32 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,625,338 to Pildner et al. ("Pildner") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,991,279 to Haugli et al. ("Haugli").

Claims 23, 27, and 30 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pildner in view of Haugli, and further in view of U.S. Patent Application No. 2001/0053710 to Gibbons et al. ("Gibbons").

Claims 1-20 have been previously canceled.

Claims 21-32 remain pending.

Objection to claim 24

Claim 24 has been objected to because this new claim has been listed as an amended claim.

The status of claim 24 has been changed to "Previously Presented".

Applicants submit that this objection is now overcome.

Objection to claim 31

Claim 31 has been objected to as incorrectly depending from previously canceled claim 4.

Claim 31 has been amended to correctly depend from independent claim 28.

Applicants submit that this objection is now overcome.

Objection to claim 23

Claim 23 has been found to be substantially a duplicate of claim 27.

Claim 23 has been canceled.

Applicants submit that this objection is now overcome.

Rejection of claims 21, 22, 24-26, and 28-32 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

With respect to claim 21, the Office Action states that the combination of Pildner and Haugli teaches all of Applicants' recited elements.

Independent claim 21 has been amended to point out more clearly what Applicants regard as the invention. Specifically, independent claim 21 has been amended to include the limitation that the reduced display module provides an accurate display of the present status of the security alarm system. Support for the claim amendment can be found on page 3, lines 5-6 of the originally filed specification.

Pildner teaches a security system having a two way wireless keypad, which operates in a particular manner for improved operation. The keypad processes information to effectively reduce communications between the control panel and the keypad. The keypad selectively

activates and deactivates a transmitter and receiver arrangement for power conservation reasons. The system provides confirmation of communications between the keypad and the control panel to increase the reliability of the system. Pildner does not teach or suggest a security alarm system that includes a reduced display module that provides an accurate display of the present status of the security alarm system.

Haugli teaches a two-way satellite communications system includes an Earth station communicating with a plurality of remote terminals using a network access protocol that facilitates low power consumption by the terminals. The earth station generates forward link TDM packet data transmissions on one or-more satellite channels, and detects, despreads and decodes multiple concurrent return link slotted CDMA packet transmissions on one or more satellite channels. It communicates through a wired connection with a packet processing center, which ultimately both delivers return link packet data to end-customers and receives forward link packet data from end-customers. The remote terminals receive, process, and act upon forward link TDM transmissions on one or more satellite channels, and generate slotted spread spectrum CDMA transmissions on the return link on one or more satellite channels. The remote terminals communicate with a local digital data source and/or sink, digitize one or more local analog sensor signals, enter into a sleep mode to minimize the terminal's power consumption, and access the satellite communications network in accordance with the system network access protocol.

In contrast, Applicants' amended independent claim 21 recites a security alarm system that includes at least one battery powered wireless keypad that includes a Radio Frequency (RF) receiver and a reduced display module that provides an accurate display of the present status of the security alarm system. The security alarm system further includes and AC powered control panel including an RF transmitter that includes a means for transmitting first periodic sync

signals which are received and used by the RF receiver to maintain proper synchronization of the receiver with the RF transmitter during second periodic wake up windows for possible transmissions of data, and a means for transmitting data during at least some of the second periodic wake up windows for the transmission of data. The receiver wakes periodically to receive first periodic sync signals, which are used by the receiver to maintain the receiver properly, synchronized with the transmitter during the second periodic wake up windows for possible transmissions of data from the transmitter. The receiver also wakes periodically for a short duration at the start of each second periodic wake up window to receive a possible transmission of data, and if no transmission is received goes back to sleep, and if a transmission is received stays awake to receive the full transmission of data, such that the average current consumed by the battery powered receiver to wake periodically to receive the first periodic sync signals to maintain synchronization and to wake periodically to listen for the possible second periodic transmissions of data is less than the average current required to maintain the receiver awake continuously.

Further, there is nothing taught or suggested in Pildner or Haugli that creates a motivation to combine the references. The Examiner cannot base obviousness upon what a person skilled in the art could, or might, try but rather must consider what the prior art would have led a person skilled in the art to do. In re Antonie, 559 F.2d 618 195 USPQ 6 (CCPA, 1977). To prevent the use of hindsight based on the invention to defeat patentability of the invention, the Examiner must show a motivation to combine the references that create the case of obviousness. In re Rouffet, 47 USPQ2d 1453 (Fed. Cir., July 15, 1998). The conclusion asserted by the Examiner represents an impermissible use of hindsight gained from the present invention.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that Pildner or Haugli, whether taken alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the subject matter recited in claim 21. Specifically, each of these references fail at least to teach or suggest a security alarm system that includes at least one battery powered wireless keypad including a Radio Frequency (RF) receiver, a reduced display module that provides an accurate display of the present status of the security alarm system, and an AC powered control panel that includes an RF transmitter that includes a means for transmitting first periodic sync signals which are received and used by the RF receiver to maintain proper synchronization of the receiver with the RF transmitter during second periodic wake up windows for possible transmissions of data, and means for transmitting data during at least some of the second periodic wake up windows for the transmission of data. The receiver wakes periodically to receive first periodic sync signals, which are used by the receiver to maintain the receiver properly, synchronized with the transmitter during the second periodic wake up windows for possible transmissions of data from the transmitter. The receiver also wakes periodically for a short duration at the start of each second periodic wake up window to receive a possible transmission of data, and if no transmission is received goes back to sleep, and if a transmission is received stays awake to receive the full transmission of data, such that the average current consumed by the battery powered receiver to wake periodically to receive the first periodic sync signals to maintain synchronization and to wake periodically to listen for the possible second periodic transmissions of data is less than the average current required to maintain the receiver awake continuously.

Independent claim 28 has been amended to recite similar features as claim 21, and therefore is patentably distinct over Pildner and Haugli for at least the reasons discussed in connection with claim 21.

Claims 22, 24-27, and 29-32, which depend directly or indirectly from the independent claims 21 and 28, incorporate all of the limitations of corresponding independent claim and are therefore patentably distinct over Pildner and Haugli for at least those reasons provided for claims 21 and 28.

Rejection of Claims 23, 27, and 30 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Pildner and Haugli have been previously discussed and do not teach or suggest the invention recited in independent claims 21 and 28.

Gibbons teaches a remote unit for a personal wireless area network including a receiver, an AC power supply, a battery-backup power supply, and a controller. The battery-backup becomes operative when the AC power supply fails and supplied power to the receiver. The controller detects when the AC power supply fails and controls the receiver and the battery-backup power supply by invoking a sleep mode of operation. The sleep mode of operation is periodically interrupted by the controller controlling the receiver and the battery-backup power supply to enter a standby mode of operation in which the receiver scans for a connect message from a base station indicating an incoming call. The controller coordinates the sleep mode and the standby mode of operations based on a frame count that is generated from an identification number of the remote unit. A highly bandwidth-efficient communications method is employed in the base station to enable it to coordinate communication with the remote unit when it changes from the sleep mode to the standby mode.

Because Pildner and Haugli do not teach or suggest the subject matter recited in independent claims 21 and 28, and because Gibbons does not teach or suggest the elements of claims 21 and 28 that Haugli is missing, Gibbons is irrelevant.

Claims 27 and 30, which depend directly or indirectly from the independent claims 21 and 28, incorporate all of the limitations of corresponding independent claim and are therefore patentably distinct over Pildner, Haugli, and Gibbons for at least those reasons provided for claims 21 and 28.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration, withdrawal of all rejections, and allowance of all pending claims in due course.

Respectfully submitted,



Bradley M. Marazas
Registration No.: 51,997

Scully, Scott, Murphy & Presser
400 Garden City Plaza, Suite 300
Garden City, New York 11530
(516) 742-4343

PJE:BMM:ej

Page 12 of 12

H:\work\1645\16128\AMEND\16128.am2.doc